



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 16, 2015 – Sacramento, California

Members Present:

Timothy Adams, So Cal Training Officers Association
Bradley Arganbright, Nor Cal Training Officers Association
John Binaski, League of California Cities
Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters
Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (alternate)
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North) (alternate)
Bret Davidson, So Cal Training Officers
Lorenzo Gigliotti, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) (alternate)
Natalie Hannum, California Fire Technology Directors Association(North)
Timi Hayward, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South)
Sam Hoffman, California State Firefighters Association (alternate)
Mary Jennings, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee
Kenneth Kehmna, Fire District Association of California
Ron Myers, League of California Cities
Daren Palacios, Metro Chiefs
Gaudenz Panholzer, California Fire Chiefs Association
Daniel Stefano, California State Firefighters Association
Joe Tyler, Cal Fire Academy
John Wagner, Nor Cal Training Officers Association (alternate)
Ken Wagner, California Fire Chiefs Association
Kim Zagaris, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)

Members Absent:

Chris Jelinek, NorCal Training Officers Association
Rich Thomas, California Professional Firefighters (alternate)
Stephen Shull, California Fire Technology Directors Association(South) (alternate)

State Fire Training Staff:

Kevin Brame, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Mike Garcia, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Lynne Gibboney, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Ron Martin, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Linda Menchaca, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Susan Pineau, Management Services Technician
Diane Radford, Division Support
Mike Richwine, Assistant State Fire Marshal and Division Chief
Mark Romer, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kris Rose, Staff Services Manager I
Rodney Slaughter, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist

Guests:

Dan Bajitos, EVALS
Matt Jewett, Sierra College
Brendan O'Leary, City College of San Francisco
Tim Palmer, Sierra College
Gail Warner, Oxnard College

I. Introductions and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 9:04 A.M. by Chief Ron Coleman.

A. Roll Call/Quorum Established

A quorum was established during introductions.

B. Member Appointment/Reappointment

1. Bret Davidson, Cal Chiefs Southern California Training Officers(member)
2. Timothy Adams, Cal Chiefs Southern California Training Officers(alternate)
3. Bradley Arganbright, Cal Chiefs Northern California Training Officers(alternate)
4. Gaudenz Panholzer, California Fire Chiefs Association(member)
5. Joe Tyler, CALFIRE (member)
6. John Binaski, League of California Cities (member)
7. Pete Jankowski, League of California Cities(alternate)
8. Taral Brideau, California Firefighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (member)
9. Mary Jennings, California Firefighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (alternate)
10. Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters (member)
11. Rich Thomas, California Professional Firefighters (alternate)

C. Past Member Recognition

1. Dennis Childress, Cal Chiefs Southern California Training Officers (member)
2. Kay Price, CALFIRE (member)
3. John Wagner, Cal Chiefs Northern California Training Officers (alternate)
4. Nathan Trauernicht, California Fire Chief's Association (member)
5. Ron Myers, League of California Cities (member)
6. Jim Skinner, League of California Cities (alternate)

D. New Member Orientation**Presenter: Ron Coleman**

Chief Coleman advised that he wanted to provide some background and set some ground rules regarding STEAC for the new committee members. The STEAC Committee was commissioned by the Office of the State Fire Marshal and has been in existence for 30 years. This was designed to be a mechanism for scrutinizing training and education before recommendations are being submitted to the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS). This is the reason the STEAC committee exists. In the packets of information each person has before them is some information for review. The first item is the committee itself, its goal, its membership, how we run the meetings, scheduling and so forth. He advised everyone to read the packet contents themselves.

Chief Coleman wanted to clarify that the primary purpose of having representation of this nature is to carry out communications to the organizations that are impacted by what goes on in State Fire Training (SFT). Chief Coleman said that a quote he heard recently states “Everybody likes to talk about change as long as it doesn’t affect them”. This segues into the fact that the majority of Firefighters in California are members of one or more of the organizations on this member list. Therefore the STEAC members are the pipeline back to the organization. Input from these meetings should be collected and disseminated back to the organization. This is vital to the success of our program. All meetings are quarterly and held in Sacramento. Participation is important. A master calendar is put out in advance of each meeting. An alternate should attend the STEAC meetings if the primary member cannot attend. We need each organization represented.

Regarding committee protocol, these meetings operate utilizing Roberts Rules of Order. However we operate under a set of guidelines called the Bagley-Keene open meeting act of 2004. These are our ground rules, and everyone can review them on their own. What we want is for everyone to weigh in on the conversation in the meetings so not one person is dominating the discussion. Meetings need to start on time, and everyone should be prepared when they come to the meeting. There is a Doctrine document that was put together for SFT in February 2014. The reason for this was to set some ground rules for performance and behaviors. This doctrine defines what we are trying to do. Support for this document is what we need and this doctrine provides the context. The way it works is that we meet quarterly and the STEAC members address the issues. Then motions are made. Depending on what that motion is, the information is relayed to the State Board of Fire Service for their final approval.

E. SFT Staff

Presenters: Mike Richwine/Kris Rose

Chief Coleman recognized Linda Menchaca for her years of contribution to State Fire Training (SFT) since June of 2007. She has made many contributions to SFT and she will be missed. Chief Richwine indicated that every now and then in a person’s career they get to observe someone in the workplace who has been impactful and truly makes a difference and demonstrates commitment daily to the work they are performing. L. Menchaca is such a person. She has had that kind of an impact to SFT and Cal Fire. She will be missed.

Natalie Hannum presented a proclamation from the California Fire Technology Directors Association to L. Menchaca for her retirement. The proclamation outlined her achievements, tenacity and professional behavior with Registered Instructors.

K. Rose added some SFT staffing information. She indicated that everyone had already met Lynne Gibboney, who will be handling the new Registered Instructor process, replacing Linda Menchaca. In addition, Kathryn Sinift replaces Kendall Fong handling the bookstore operations beginning January 30, 2015. K. Fong was promoted and moved to another position within Cal Fire. Cassandra Fine also moved on to another position with the State, so her position is currently vacant.

II. Agenda Review

Daren Palacios needs to leave at 10:30 A.M. due to a flight change. Chief Richwine, Kris Rose and Ken Wagner need to leave for a scheduled 2:00 p.m. flight to the Pro Board Conference in San Diego.

III. Approval of the October 17, 2014 Minutes

Motion: *Ken Kehmna moved to accept the minutes from October 17, 2014.
Dan Stefano seconded the motion.*
Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

IV. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

Chief Richwine announced that the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) affirmatively moved all of our action items. SBFS approved Community Risk Educator, Community Risk Specialist and Community Risk Officer Standards and Curriculum, Fire Instructor III Standards and Curriculum, Chief Fire Officer Standards and Curriculum and the Executive Chief Fire Officer Standards and Curriculum. A discussion about the implementation plans and procedures for new State Fire Training curriculum also took place. One area of feedback discussed internally, is that a couple of members expressed their desire that we continue to strive for diversity in cadre representation, not only with gender and race, but diversity amongst the fire service organization and the members that are represented. We will continue to strive to meet that goal.

V. Mission Alignment Objectives

Chief Coleman stated that the concept of mission alignment is not something new to the California Fire Service. This process has been under way for several years. Chief Richwine indicated that Blueprint 2020 was created in 2006 and signed off in 2008. Chief Coleman indicated that those who have not seen the document should take a look at it, because there is a lot of activity going on that precedes the decisions we are getting ready to make now. He encourages everyone to become familiar with the Blueprint 2020 and monitor the website for information. When we talk about mission alignment this is all about taking the system how it currently looks and continuing to narrow it down and focus it on competencies, performance, elimination of redundancy and making some sense out of the system from a professional development point of view. Mission alignment is all about trimming off the excess.

A. Achieving National Recognition

1. Firefighter I Certification Examination Process

Presenter: Ken Wagner

(Attachment 1)

Ken Wagner indicated that for this presentation he will abstain from voting. The certification exam process and IFSAC and Pro Board accreditation were originally placed on the agenda together. The reason these were brought forward, was in Blueprint 2020, there was a desire from stakeholders that the State Fire Training (SFT) system should be aligned with the national certification body, IFSAC and Pro Board. There was also the idea that we embrace the concept of Capstone certification exams. We can't be accredited by IFSAC and Pro Board if we don't implement certification exams. At the July 2013 STEAC meeting, the first formal presentation was made at how this whole system would look if we were to move forward with implementation. STEAC members at that time asked to separate the two topics and talk about them independently and so in preceding meetings it has been brought up as two separate topics.

The first is the Firefighter I (FFI) certification exam process. Our focus has been on Fire Fighter I because it has been the building block of our system. From the idea of implementing requirements that will satisfy IFSAC and Pro Board, we know this will be the hardest to implement and to satisfy their rules. Since the July 19, 2013, STEAC meeting, K. Wagner stated we have made at least 20 presentations across the state to get stakeholders to understand what is involved. We have worked extensively with California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA), because our model is that the certification exam process will be administered by our Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP). We have also significantly engaged our Accredited Local Academies (ALA). We conducted two one day briefings six months apart here in Sacramento inviting all of the ALA'S to send representatives so we could brief them on this concept and understand their concerns and their needs. Our outreach has been extensive.

We are now out doing regional presentations on the curriculum updates and the Firefighter I and II and how the certification exam process will work. We are continuing outreach across counties. We will continue to get out among the stakeholders to complete, as Chief Richwine calls it, our missionary work to make sure everyone understands how this process is intended to work. We need to take their feedback and continue to be open and look at how we can modify our concept of the certification exam process to meet the requirements of IFSAC and Pro board yet meet the requirements and needs of our stakeholders and those groups that will actually be implementing the exam process.

In order to implement the process, the timely goal is to obtain approval from STEAC today and on February 19, 2015, request the approval from the State Board of Fire Services. That would open the door for us to commit the staff time and materials to putting together our self-assessment documents and plans and final applications to IFSAC and Pro Board. Once we do that, we would plan after July 1, 2015 and by the end of the calendar year to schedule a peer review site visit for IFSAC and Pro Board to review our systems. We will set up a mock skills exam and written exam with Sierra College so IFSAC and Pro Board can see how we will administer the program. Assuming we have approval from IFSAC and Pro Board by the end of the calendar year, in 2016 we would move forward to a statewide rollout. We would be conducting the required evaluator training and working with our ALA'S and ARTP'S to get them up to speed on how to administer these exams.

Students who complete their training using the new Fire Fighter curriculum (2013) will not be held up from receiving their FFI Certifications. We have a long standing successful certification system, in order to be accredited by IFSAC and Pro Board we will now have to adjust our program to fit within their system. All challenges and changes need to be reviewed prior to a statewide rollout. One of the items that came up in these discussions from California Professional Firefighters (CPF) is the concept of cost. There is an analysis that we did with California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA) on costs to conduct the certification exams. Many of the community colleges have said that they can integrate in this certification exam without a fee increase. Others have said changes to unit of credit may need to be added to accommodate this testing. If there is a reason the college cannot deliver the testing as a component of a 4 unit class, maybe they have to do this as a community education class. In this case, the fees could go up. They have to recoup their entire cost. Those fees could be over \$300, and close to \$400 depending on the college's rate. Many have said that they are not going to have to charge anything, because they have internal systems in place that this can become a part of.

If the written and skills exams are bundled together, it would be a \$10.00 cost to the student which would come to SFT to help offset our costs. Each student will pay \$18.00 directly to our written exam vendor, Performance Training Systems. This is a nominal cost for transition. This exam process costs less than 50% of other exam processes that are out there.

Chief Coleman opened up the floor for discussion. Bret Davidson asked if we are going to a 3rd party vendor to do that written examination regardless of whether we get approval from IFSAC and Pro Board. K. Wagner stated that the position of SFT is to move forward with the implementation of the Capstone certification exam process even if we are not successful with IFSAC and Pro Board. That is the direction we need to go for the professionalism of our career paths in the state of

California. The way we have this set up now, is that the skills examination and the written examination would be proctored through ARTPS and ALAs. When they proctor the skills exam, they will use their staff, with prior approval and training by SFT. They will need to proctor the written exam, but the exam itself is conducted online by the third party vendor, Performance Training Systems. SFT will maintain security of the written exam process with them.

Under our model we accredit certain Fire Departments and Community Colleges. Those Community Colleges and Fire Departments that are not accredited will have to look to accredited agencies to have their candidates go through the examination process.

Natalie Hannum indicated that we came to an agreement that the colleges would adopt the new Fire Fighter standards by fall of 2015. It takes the colleges anywhere from nine to twelve months to make changes to its curriculum which is why lead time is needed on the other elements that are coming forward. The colleges have agreed to offer test dates or courses that will provide open enrollment for those who are obtaining their training in a non- college academy model. We can then have the testing available on a statewide basis and open to everyone.

John Binaski asked if the proposal here is just for the Firefighter I portion. K. Wagner said yes, any others, such as Fire Fighter II would come later down the road. J Binaski then stated that a large number of California fire departments test for candidates that are already academy graduates. J. Binaski asked to be walked through the process of how to identify the academy graduate that has completed the academy now, and then post 2016 and has completed the skills assessment and written exam successfully. K. Wagner responded that some academies have told us that they are going to divide the process and run the academy like they do now. The student passes or fails, and has an academy completion certificate from that academy not from the state.

For those who did not complete a formal academy they can enroll the students in another small course that gets them through the certification exam process. Depending on how the agency wants to write their job specifications, they can say they have successfully completed an academy, delivered by an ARTP. Or, the agency could say they have completed an academy delivered by an ARTP, and successfully passed the written and skills examination as required by SFT. If the academy chooses to provide a certificate they can do that. The candidates, at the successful conclusion of the testing process, will receive a document from SFT on state letterhead that provides the results of how they did on the written and the skills exam. This can be used to show they have demonstrated and shown the proficiency of completing the written and skills exam.

K. Wagner stated that in addition to completing the skills and written examination for certification they have to complete the task book, perform either the 6 months or 1 year occupational experience, and have the final form from the task book and the application signed by their Chief. They must then submit all prerequisites coursework in order to get their certification. A question was asked whether the testing process comes after the task book and the items are completed. K. Wagner stated that there has been a lot of internal discussion on this and it was presented to STEAC before. We made the decision that candidates would be eligible to participate in the written and skills examinations when they have completed the coursework associated with the level of certification.

J. Binaski asked if SFT is prepared for the influx of academies planning to be accredited in the future so they can do their own testing. K. Wagner said we have discussed this and we are up to that challenge. However, there are some things to think about such as there is more to the concept of being an ALA then just administering this examination process. If we have a fully functioning, engaged ARTP in an area that is responding to the needs of a Fire Service community, we would be remiss to grant an agency within that area status as an ALA, unless they have a profound demonstrated need to do that. Chief Coleman stated that the community colleges and creation of the accredited academies is not just about certification. This has to do with the entire delivery system, or what we call mission alignment.

Tara Brideau asked is there financial assistance for those needing it. N. Hannum said yes, financial aid is available under Title 4 for all students enrolled in a community college program. The amount of financial aid is dependent on how much they have used at that point. Chief Coleman interjected that we have a problem we are not addressing and that is how many Firefighters have completed their Fire Fighter I and do not have a job in the state of California. This process is to try to improve their employability as opposed to just getting a certificate. K. Wagner stated that we cannot really speak to candidates who have completed their FFI training through alternate delivery methods. We have questioned the academy, both the ALA'S and the ARTP'S and we are informed that between those two groups on an annual basis there is approximately 3500 candidates enrolling in Fire Fighter I academies. SFT is seeing approximately 1500 candidates per year who actually get FFI Certification. Timothy Adams asked if it would be safe to say that SFT is accepting the fact that the mission alignment and standardization vision is good, but as we roll that out and meet that, are we more worried about meeting the NFPA and IFSAC and Pro Board minimums and we are not as concerned about certification? Chief Richwine said that IFSAC and Pro Board as a national certification, would be available as voluntary and on the state certification, it is also

voluntary and we are requiring the written and skills testing in order to comply with desires of fire services Blueprint 2020 to have a capstone exam process.

K. Wagner stated that as they've been around the state and talking about this process and there have been a lot of concerns aired about the wide variety of firefighter training that is available through community colleges and fire departments. The idea of having this capstone certification exam will help to significantly if not fully, level the playing field.

So as a Fire Chief in the hiring process, there would no longer be a concern about where the training took place. They would know they demonstrated competency in the skills and job performance requirements associated with that particular level of certification. Chief Coleman provided an explanation of the proposed certification examination process to those new members, so there is an understanding of the decisions made so it is acceptable to the State Board of Fire Services.

Motion: ***Natalie Hannum moved to accept the proposed Firefighter I Certification Examination Process.***

Bret Davidson seconded the motion.

Action: ***All members voted unanimously.***

2. Implementation of IFSAC/Pro Board Certification

Presenter: Ken Wagner

(Attachment 2)

Ken Wagner stated when this was previously presented; we came forward with the idea that IFSAC and Pro Board certifications should be part and parcel to our California certification process. If a candidate applied in California, they would get their certification from California and they would also receive their seals from IFSAC and Pro Board. There was some concern about making this mandatory. Part of the reason we wanted to roll them together was because we believed in issuing and processing certifications, and there was some economy in scale in delivering those together. Since there was significant concerns brought up about this being rolled together as a requirement, we have since decided to separate them. A candidate would after completing their training, their task book, the certification exams, their occupational experience, could then apply to SFT. That application would be for California certification. If they choose to also obtain National certification, they would then pay an additional fee and would then also receive an IFSAC and Pro Board seal on their certification. The total fee would be \$80. The fee for Fire Fighter I is \$40 and an additional fee of \$40 for IFSAC and Pro Board certification. If they choose not to select national certification, they are not required to do so.

Randy Collins stated that he would like to ask that we request SFT to track the number of applications that are strictly the state versus those that are state and

national, and report back to this group. This will be telling as to what the students are going to want. He said that he has been hearing from his students that they want both certifications because they may end up in other states.

K. Wagner confirmed that the process would be training, then the skills and written exam process, occupational experience which includes the task book signed off by the Fire Chief. Once everything has been completed a Fire Fighter I certification would be issued. K. Wagner abstained from voting due to his involvement in the gathering of data.

Motion: *Ken Kehmna moved to accept the implementation of the IFSAC/Pro Board certification process.
Gaudenz Panholzer seconded the motion.*
Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

3. Santa Rosa Junior College Reaccreditation

Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 3)

In conjunction with Ken Wagner's IFSAC Pro Board presentation there were 11 academies reviewed last year. Oxnard and Santa Rosa were in October and November 2014 respectively. The site team included Robert Briare, STEAC representative, Jim Connors, California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA), Wellington Jackson of Merritt College and Rodney Slaughter, representing State Fire Training. Randy Collins indicated that he has to work with 56 different fire agencies in his district, of which most are volunteer departments. Another aspect is that they have an unprecedented 20% female instructor population. Initial campuses were accredited back in the early 90's. R. Collins indicated there is a huge push in that institution for diversity, and we all recognize that the demographics are changing. Although Santa Rosa is still implementing their diversity plan on a college wide level, this is one of the areas they do really well in. One of areas they are working towards in diversity is becoming a Hispanic serving institution. Approval was just received from the department of education for extra funding mechanisms coming to the college for that. R. Collins believes they are going in the right direction and he wishes to help meet the mission of State Fire Training (SFT). R. Collins abstained from voting due to his involvement with Santa Rosa College.

Motion: *Kim Zagaris moved to accept the reaccreditation of Santa Rosa Junior College.
Ken Wagner seconded the motion.*
Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

4. Oxnard College Reaccreditation

Presenter: Rodney Slaughter

(Attachment 4)

The site team consisted of Russell Rawls of State Board of Fire Service(SBFS), David Senior, California Fire Technology Directors Association(CFTDA), Jamie Hirsch of Mount San Antonio College and Rodney Slaughter. We had an opportunity to visit Oxnard College twice in October last year. Oxnard College sponsored one of the early rollouts of the Fire Fighter I examination process. We went back two weeks later to do the accreditation process. Oxnard College and their staff are strong supporters of IFSAC and Pro Board, and the Fire Fighter I program. The campus has new classroom facilities, spaces, a laboratory, tools, equipment, many of which are donated by Ventura County Fire, and they have support from the local fire service. Oxnard College has been using Survey Monkey to monitor student job placement. There is an issue with clerical support however. Gail Warner has a part time person working in the office now, but prior to the site teams visit, management recognized the deficiency and has plans on supporting this with a full time person that should be on board in February.

They are also going through IFSAC degree accreditation the first week of February. To tag along behind what Randy Collins said about his institution and diversity, they have a broad range of professional experts and faculty from a large surrounding area which extends into the Hispanic influences. Natalie Hannum stated that Oxnard College is a phenomenal facility. It is a great example of a tight partnership with local fire service agencies. It is probably one of the nicest, most concise fire academy facilities she has ever seen.

Chief Coleman stated that this particular process has strengthened our SFT system by being able to establish these relationships with the community colleges, and to be able to demonstrate through the self -assessment process what they've got on the ground. The degree in which we can continue with this process is going to help us.

Motion: ***John Binaski moved to accept the Reaccreditation of Oxnard College. Timi Hayward seconded the motion.***

Action: ***All members voted unanimously.***

B. Curriculum Development & Delivery

1. Fire Prevention 1Prerequisite for Command 1A

Presenter: Randy Collins

(Attachment 5)

Randy Collins advised there has been a precipitous drop in the enrollment in the Command 1A class. Historically this has been a popular course. There are a lot of volunteers in his county which make up a large composition of the enrollment in this class. From the information he has received the Prevention 1 prerequisite is posing a challenge. The volunteers have limited time, and are not in the company

officer track so they don't have an overwhelming interest in taking the Prevention 1 class to begin with. Santa Rosa Junior College students, who want to sign up for a CFSTES class, must complete a prerequisite challenge form. Challenge forms must be submitted to R. Collins, which he personally reviews and approves. R. Collins stated he was getting fewer forms for the Command1A class. This was important enough to be shared and brought up at the Training Officer's level. They asked him to bring this to the STEAC meeting and request that the pre requisite be removed from the requirements. This information was shared at the October 2014 STEAC meeting, and was also brought up by R. Collins in the Chiefs meetings since then. They were supportive of this request. This was also brought up at the September California Fire Technology Directors meeting as a good of the order item. The overwhelming response from that meeting was also to request removal this prerequisite from the Command 1A course. This would improve enrollment for Command 1A for the volunteers who are not interested in pursuing the company officer track but want to take this class to expand their skills and knowledge. Someone who is in the company officer track will eventually need to take the Prevention 1 course in order to get certified. Chief Richwine said that one of the recommended solutions presented before was that the issue will get resolved with the retirement of the Command1A course as of December 31, 2016. A discussion ensued with Brett Davidson, Mark Romer, Natalie Hannum, Ken Wagner, Kim Zagaris, Ken Kehmna, Mike Richwine, Ron Coleman and Rodney Slaughter all participating.

Chief Richwine stated that he would work on creating an interim procedure that will allow for an advisory term, that is not precedent setting, and is specific to this class on a case by case basis. He will then send this out to all STEAC members and upon approval will present to the State Board of Fire Services. Chief Coleman called for a vote on the Motion, followed by a vote on the amendment.

Motion: *Gaudenz Panholder moved for an administrative interim procedure to be created that will allow for an advisory term specific to Command 1A. Robert Briare seconded the motion.*
Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

2. Update to Inspector II Curriculum Prerequisites

**Presenter: Mark Romer
(Attachment 6)**

Mark Romer indicated that starting in 2010 a re-write of the whole fire prevention track was started. This was the ground breaking process that took us to development of our model that we use today for curriculum development. This update is to advise of a minor change to the level 2A curriculum for Inspector. The prerequisite for this course originally stated that you must be a certified Inspector I in order to take this course. It

will now read “completed the educational requirements for certification”, which consists of 1A, 1B, 1C & 1D. This now puts us in line with what NFPA requires.

3. Hybrid Course Approval Process

**Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 7)**

A STEAC sub-committee was formed to identify what new classes were coming up that could be put in a hybrid process. The process now requires the community college and/or an instructor to identify what elements in the class are going to be taught electronically. The word hybrid has been removed, recognizing that there are other ways of delivering technical information electronically. This could be in the form of pod cast, websites, social media and so forth. Chief Richwine wants to keep track of how the courses will be delivered both in the classroom and electronically. There is a course delivery agreement the community colleges complete and submit to State Fire Training (SFT). Currently we have the following three colleges who have this agreement, Alan Hancock College, Miramar College and Lake Tahoe College. The last page in attachment 7 in your packet indicates the course outline content as SFT would like to see the classes broken down. That is to identify what parts are being taught in the classroom versus those that are taught by an electronic method. This provides the colleges and Instructors some guidelines as to how to present the material to SFT for approval process. This identifies specific classes that were delivered electronically in the past, but leaves this open ended should an Instructor wish to suggest other programs they would like to offer in a hybrid fashion.

4. SFT Regulations Update

**Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 8)**

Rodney Slaughter brought this information to STEAC originally about a year ago, which proposed changes to Title 19 of the regulations. There have been a lot of changes since the regulations were put in place back in 2008. Our next regulations package updates Title 19. It also updates the Procedures Manual and the Course Information Requirements Materials (CIRM) manual in 2015. All three documents will be part of the next Title 19 regulations package. The highlighted sections in your package shows what is being added and what is being deleted from the Title 19 regulations. It is important to note that we are trying to align Title 19 with IFSAC and Pro Board. There is language in here that will help move that process forward as we go into the next phase of regulations. This regulations packaged does not include all of the new certification classes, or everything that we have changed so far. It just updates the Procedures Manual, and the CIRM manual to a certain point. All of the new certification classes will be updated further down the road.

The plan for this regulations package is to get it to the regulations office by the end of January 2015. It will be noticed in March after signoffs have been obtained. If there are no issues with the regulations package from our constituent groups we can potentially have the Title 19 regulations, the updated Procedures Manual and the updated CIRM in place July 1, 2015. If the July 1, 2015 date is not met, it could be pushed back to October 1, 2015. R. Slaughter also indicated that this is the first of the regulation updates this year.

After this process is completed, we can add the new class information. Chief Richwine added that the intent is to restructure the document into chapter and page so that when we make changes in the future it is easier to update and amend the document. It will eliminate re-publishing the entire document as we have had to do in the past.

We have also eliminated a lot of redundancy in the document, as well as to add general categories for instructor accountability so that does not have to be carried throughout for each course that is taught. The old and the new manual will be published on the web so you will have the contrast to review. Kris Rose commented that the new Procedures Manual will include the new Fire Fighter I & II and Inspector I & II. Randy Collins asked Ken Wagner if we anticipate these being updated again after IFSAC and Pro Board. K. Wagner stated yes that he would sit down with R. Slaughter, as some of this would be regulatory in nature and some will be internal processes that will need further updates at that time.

5. Water Rescue Classes

**Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 9)**

Rodney Slaughter stated he would defer this discussion to Chief Richwine. Chief Richwine advised that the information sheet is for proposed water rescue courses. The fire marshal at OES would like to continue dialog on the development and use of these courses for the future.

C. Cross Generational Marking

**Presenter: Kris Rose
(Attachment 10)**

1. Curriculum Timelines at a Glance

Kris Rose advised that State Fire Training (SFT) was asked by the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) and other agencies to create a timeline that provides the transition and implementation certification timeline dates listed from Fire Fighter I up through the Community Risk track. We created a consolidated easy to read handout of all of the recent changes for meeting discussion purposes.

VI. Announcements/Correspondence

Presenter: Ron Coleman

A. SFT E-News Subscription Service

Presenter: Kris Rose

Kris Rose indicated that since she has been in State Fire Training (SFT) she has been working to create a subscription service. This allows someone to log onto the SFT website, sign up and then SFT would send out new information as it becomes available. This would be similar to how we have hot topics on our website or how we send emails to stakeholders. This is now available for sign up on our website under SFT E News. Seventy people signed up in the first week. Also we have added the twitter feed to our website. We are trying more ways to get information out to everyone. This process took two years from start to finish. K. Rose also mentioned that Wi-Fi is being worked on for both conference rooms in this building. Hopefully it will be in place by the April STEAC meeting. We are hoping not to have to print the agenda and attachments going forward.

Chief Richwine stated that it is refreshing that we have several new members here. He said he is appreciative of all past members as well as the new members and it is enjoyable to have spirited conversations such as occurred today. He would like everyone to please continue in this manner, as it is engaging and important that we discuss and work through different viewpoints. When we go to SBFS, if we cannot answer their tough questions, we have not done our work here. He thanked everyone for their participation.

VII. Roundtable

Randy Collins stated that with all of the changes to Fire Fighter I he was able to get a fulltime instructional assistant.

Timothy Adams shared that 2014 was a record year. There were over 600 Fire Fighters trained. There are plans for a 20th anniversary celebration at the Fresno Symposium in November 2015. Special invites will be sent out in early March for a special awards ceremony the week of November 16th. They are looking for this to be a very memorable occasion. T. Adams advised that they are looking for historical input as their board is new. Chief Richwine and Chief Coleman said that they can assist with gathering historical information to assist T. Adams.

Chief Richwine shared that Ken Wagner, Kris Rose, as well as himself will be at the Pro Board meeting this afternoon. Chief Hoover and B. Erickson are already there. Chief Hoover is speaking tonight about all of the changes that are occurring with State Fire Training. Staff will be attending workshops on Saturday regarding implementation of accreditation. We are looking forward to attending with our national peers.

VIII. Future Meeting Dates

A. April 17, 2015, July 17, 2015 and October 16, 2015

IX. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:18p.m.